



This Action is in response to the Preliminary Amendment filed on June 6, 1994.

Claims 14 to 28 are pending in the instant application.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 14 to 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Patel et al.

Figure 1 of Patel is directed to a dynamic RAM having a plurality of memory cells (10a and 10b) and a plurality of modes (see column 3, lines 18 to 19). A first external terminal (34) is provided for receiving a row address strobe signal RAS. A second external terminal (35) is provided for receiving a column address strobe signal CAS. A third external terminal (36) is provided for receiving a write enable signal W. A fourth external terminal (16) is provided for receiving a designating signal. A first means 37 is coupled to the first, second and third external terminals for detecting levels of the applied signals. A second means 22 is coupled to the fourth terminal thru lead 24 and to the first means to clock generator 37 by timing signal ϕ_{pn} .

Art Unit 2511

In claims 18, 22 and 24, the holding circuit is analogous to the latch 47 shown in Figure 3 of Patel.

Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 22, line 16, "said first means" does not have antecedent basis.

In claim 24, line 11, "on" should be changed to one.


Applicant is advised that claim 22 is a substantial duplicate of claim 18. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to reject the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. M.P.E.P. 706.03 (k). Therefore, should the indicated claim be found allowable, the duplicate claim will be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claim 18 sets forth first and second "means" while claim 22 sets forth first and second "circuit". The terms "means" and "circuit" are deemed to be coextensive and no difference in scope is seen to exist.


Serial No. 234,416

-4-

Art Unit 2311

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Joseph Popek at telephone number (703) 308-0956.

 Popek/tj
August 26, 1994


JOSEPH A. POPEK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2500